REMARKS

Claims 42-57 are currently pending. In light of the remarks below, reconsideration is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant's counsel, Nathan Grebasch, wishes to thank Examiner Roswell for conducting a telephonic interview on December 16, 2008.

During the interviews, Counsel and the Examiner discussed the Lum/Rosenzweig/Apte combination. In particular, Counsel and the Examiner discussed, with respect to claim 42, the feature of "wrap one or more display controls that are attached to the list with a property that stores a unique identifier that specifies which said data element a particular said display control is currently displaying, the unique identifier identifying an additional property of said data element from the data source without listening to a data item corresponding to said data element." The substance of the interview is reflected in the remarks below. No formal agreement was reached.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if the Examiner believes there are any further issues that might delay issuance.

Rejections under § 103

Claims 42-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,065,041 to Lum et al. (hereinafter, "Lum") in view of U.S. Patent 7,020,848 to Rosenzweig (hereinafter, "Rosenzweig") further in view of U.S. Patent 6,289,395 to Apte et al. (hereinafter, "Apte"). Applicant traverses the rejection.

Applicant makes no representation that the cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any of the cited references are prior art. Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under

35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

Claim 42 recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

- an application;
- a data source locally accessible to the application that includes a plurality of data elements;
- software to select a configuration and an appearance of a list of data items from the data source to be presented; and
- a list manager to be instantiated by the software to:
    act as an interface between the data source and the list;
    receive the configuration and the appearance from the software, access the data source, and populate the list of data items according to the configuration and the appearance; and
    wrap one or more display controls that are attached to the list with a property that stores a unique identifier that specifies which said data element a particular said display control is currently displaying, the unique identifier identifying an additional property of said data element from the data source *without listening to a data item corresponding to said data element*.

In making out the rejection of claim 42, the Office has relied on the Apte reference as teaching "without listening to a data item corresponding to said data element." In particular, the Office has relied on Apte, Col. 2, lines 25-46 for this teaching. For the Office's convenience, the relied on portion of Apte is provided directly below.

Apte, Col. 2, lines 25-45.

The Office's rejection is incorrect because Apte's generic event listener fails to teach the feature of "without listening to a data item" as contended by the Office. Moreover, the contended combination of Lum/Rosenwig/Apte is improper as Apte teaches away from the contended combination in addition to the subject matter of claim 42.

The Office's reliance on Apte is misplaced because Apte's generic event listener is "connected to scriptable objects." Apte, Col. 2, lines 10-12. Thus, although the generic event listener may listen to arbitrary events, the generic event listener is still "connected to scriptable objects." This is to say that following Apte's teachings one would be taught to <u>connect a generic event handler to a scriptable object</u> thereby forcing the generic event handler to "listen" (as contended by the Office) to events from the scriptable object. As a result, although Apte's generic event listener may listen for arbitrary events (e.g., "all possible events" in various formats), Apte's generic event listener does so based on its connection to a scriptable object. Therefore, not only does Apte fail to teach "without listening to a data item corresponding to said data element," but Apte specifically teaches that the generic event listener <u>must be connected to the</u>

scriptable object. In other words, the contended combination of Lum/Rosenzwig/Apte fails to teach the feature of "without listening to a data item corresponding to said data element" because Apte teaches that the generic event listener is connected to the scriptable object.

Further, while the Office notes that Apte's sources (an event source) and sinks (event listeners) may not know of each other's existence, this contention misinterprets the claim. This is to say, that while Ape's sources and sinks may not know of the other's existence, Apte's sink is still listening to the source. In contrast, claim 42 recites "without listening to a data item corresponding to said data element."

Moreover, the inclusion of the Apte reference in the Lum/Rosenzwig combination is improper because Apte also teaches away from the feature of "wrap one or more display controls." In particular, Apte, Col. 2, lines 41-44, teaches "[w]ith an event processing module as described, event sinks need not be wrapped to become an event listener...." As a result, one reading Apte would be discouraged from combining Apte with Lum/Rosenzwig because Apte specifically discourages "wrapping."

For at least the foregoing reasons, the contended combination of Lum/Rosenzwig/Apte is improper. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claims 43 and 44 each depend from independent claim 42 which is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 43 and 44 additionally recite features which are additionally patentable. Removal of the pending rejection to claims 43 and 44 is requested and allowance is solicited.

Claim 51 recites a list generating engine that extends an application program interface (API), comprising (emphasis added):

- means for receiving properties of a user-selectable display list to be displayed in a graphical user interface from an application;
  - means for attaching user-selectable display controls to the display list;

- means for accessing data elements from a data source, the data elements to be displayed in the display controls;
- means for establishing a display state of the display controls;
- means for receiving a request to change data elements in the display controls;
- means for managing the data elements in the display controls according to the display state; and
- means for requesting an additional property of said data element from the data source beyond that which is currently displayed within the display list *without listening to a display control corresponding to said data element*.

The rejection of claim 51 is improper as the combination of Lum/Rosenzweig/Apte fails to teach the above features. The rejection is improper as the Apte reference, relied on for teaching "without listening to a display control corresponding to said data element" fails to teach this feature. More particularly, Apte fails to teach this feature because Apte specifically teaches that the generic event listener is connected to a scriptable object. As a result, although the generic event listener may "listen" (as contended by the Office) to an arbitrary event that may be in a variety of formats, the generic event listener does so based on detecting an event from the scriptable object.

Further, the Office's contention that Apte's source and sink teach the feature of "without listening to a display control corresponding to said data element" is misplaced. While Apte does state that the sink and source do not know of the other's existence, Apte's sink still listens to the source. This is to say that Apte's sink is configured to listen for events from the source. Accordingly, Apte's sink and source fail to teach the feature of "without listening to a display control corresponding to said data element."

Moreover, Apte teaches away from the contended combination with Lum/Rosenzweig as Apte teaches that the listener detects the event from the scriptable object when the scriptable object fires the event. Apte, Abstract. For at least the foregoing reasons, removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claims 52-57 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 51 which is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 52-57 additionally recite features which are additionally patentable. Removal of the pending rejection to claims 52-57 is requested and allowance is solicited.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/26/09

By: /Nathan Grebasch/
Nathan Grebasch
Reg. No. 48600
Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS
422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: (509) 755-7267
Facsimile: (509) 755-7252